




PREPRINTS
Plenary and Index Volume



13th World Congress of IFAC
International Federation of Automatic Control

San Francisco, CA, USA
June 30 - July 5, 1996

Hosted by the American
Automatic Control Council

FROM YOUILA-KUCERA TO IDENTIFICATION, ADAPTIVE AND NONLINEAR CONTROL

Brian D.O. Anderson¹

Abstract. Some twenty years ago, formulae were presented for the set of all linear time-invariant controllers stabilizing a linear time-invariant plant. This paper traces the development of many ideas from these formulae, covering linear H_2 and H_∞ control, identification, adaptive control and nonlinear systems.

Keywords. Linear Systems, nonlinear systems, identification, adaptive control, Youla-Kucera parameter

1. WHAT IS THIS PAPER ABOUT?

This paper is about a useful way of parametrizing plants and controllers - in the first instance linear plants and controllers. The idea had its origin decades ago, is still giving rise to theoretical developments, for example in problems of closed-loop identification, adaptive control, and nonlinear systems, and is being carried over into practice, one recent reported case being in controller design for flotation circuits.

We begin with motivating material, concerning the desirability of a parametrization of all stabilizing controllers for a prescribed linear time-invariant plant. The Youla-Kucera parametrization is presented, using fractional descriptions of plants and controllers via stable rational transfer functions. Examples of its applications are noted. We then turn to more recent developments. For linear systems, these include the incorporation of the parametrization into state-space formulas (with applications to approximate loop transfer recovery, and to

direct adaptive control); we also note the solution of H_2 and H_∞ problems with constrained pole positions.

A dual parametrization (of all plants stabilized by a fixed controller) is the basis for solving closed-loop identification problems by their reduction to standard open-loop problems, and the application of this concept to an adaptive control methodology (windsurfer adaptive control).

It is possible to consider Youla-Kucera parameters simultaneously associated with plant and controller. We explore this concept, considering how a small change in a plant (represented by introduction of a nonzero Youla-Kucera parameter) should give rise to a corresponding controller change, when the design issue is stability, H_2 optimality or H_∞ gain limiting.

Finally, we describe very recent work on nonlinear systems, including closed-loop identification, and Youla-Kucera parametrizations for general nonlinear plant-controller interconnections.

2. THE BASIC IDEA AND SOME OF ITS HISTORY

Let $P(s)$ be the rational transfer function of a stable open-loop plant with $P(\infty) = 0$. How can all stabilizing controllers be characterized? Knowing one stabilizing controller $C(s)$ and $P(s)$, we can define

¹ Research School of Information Sciences and Engineering and Cooperative Research Centre for Robust and Adaptive Systems, Australian National University, ACT 0200, Australia. The author wishes to acknowledge the funding of the activities of the Cooperative Research Centre for Robust and Adaptive Systems by the Australian Commonwealth Government under the Cooperative Research Centres Program.




Fig. 1. Stabilized feedback loop showing plant $P(s)$ and controller $C(s)$

$$Q(s) = \frac{C(s)}{1 + C(s)P(s)}, \quad (2.1)$$

while if $Q(s)$ and $P(s)$ are known, we could recover $C(s)$ by

$$C(s) = \frac{Q(s)}{1 - P(s)Q(s)}. \quad (2.2)$$

It is easily checked that if $C(s)$ is stabilizing for $P(s)$ and is proper, i.e. $C(\infty)$ is finite, then $Q(s)$ is stable and proper. Conversely, if $Q(s)$ is any stable proper transfer function, and $C(s)$ is defined by (2.1), then $C(s)$ is necessarily a stabilizing controller for $P(s)$.

Thus stabilizing controllers are parametrized in terms of the set of all stable proper transfer functions.

The result probably does not seem very exciting. But there is an important bonus: the closed-loop transfer function $G(s)$ is given in terms of $P(s)$ and $Q(s)$ by

$$G(s) = P(s)Q(s). \quad (2.3)$$

The linearity in the free stable transfer function $Q(s)$ is what gives the added appeal. Also, $Q(s)$ does have intrinsic significance: it is the transfer function from r to u (see Figure 1).

It is now well recognised that many closed-loop specifications are convex in $G(s)$ and hence convex in $Q(s)$, but not of course convex in $C(s)$; the convexity is of great assistance in design (Boyd and Barrett, 1991).

The idea of reparametrizing a controller design problem to obtain linearity in the design transfer function is probably an old one; for example, it appeared in (Newton *et al.*, 1957). The formula (2.2) appears in (Zames, 1981) and is well known in chemical process control as "internal model control" - because the controller is viewed as an interconnection of $Q(s)$ in a forward loop and $P(s)$ in a positive feedback loop, see (Morari and Zafriou, 1989).

As expressed above, the idea is limited to scalar plants, which are open-loop stable. How can this substantial limitation be lifted?

3. YOULA-KUCERA PARAMETRIZATION

Youla *et al.* (Youla *et al.*, 1976) and Kucera (Kucera, 1975) appear to have independently explained how the ideas of section 2 extend to MIMO plants which are not necessarily stable.

There are two key features in their idea. First, they assume one stabilizing controller is a priori known, so the task becomes one of characterizing all, already knowing one. [If the plant is a priori stable, $C(s) = 0$ is immediately known to be stabilizing]. Second, they describe plants using polynomial fractional representations.

Thus if $P(s)$ is the rational transfer function of a scalar plant, one thinks of it as $n(s)/d(s)$, where n and d are polynomials, both coprime to avoid difficulties. If $P(s)$ is multivariable, it can be regarded as $N(s)D^{-1}(s)$ or $\bar{D}^{-1}(s)\bar{N}(s)$, where N, D etc. are matrices of polynomials; a form of coprimeness condition is imposed.

It became evident that a tidier formulation was available if one moved away from polynomial fractional representations to *stable transfer function fractional representations*. Thus a plant with transfer function $(s-1)^{-1}$, instead of being regarded as a fraction with numerator and denominator 1 and $s-1$ respectively (both polynomials), can be regarded as a fraction with numerator $1/(s+1)$ and denominator $(s-1)(s+1)^{-1}$ (both stable rational transfer functions).

Because stable proper rational transfer functions form an algebraic entity known as a euclidean domain (an observation certainly going back to (Forney, 1970) and exploited by (Desoer *et al.*, 1980) etc. and (Vidyasagar, 1985) for the present purposes) notions such as coprimeness, and greatest common divisor determination via a euclidean algorithm and the like can be used.

Let S denote the set of stable proper rational transfer functions (in continuous or discrete time). Two matrices N, D with entries in S and with the same number of columns are said to be right coprime if there exist matrices $\bar{X}, \bar{Y} \in S$ with $\bar{X}N + \bar{Y}D = I$.

The main result is as follows. As with the earlier result for scalar, open-loop stable plants, it characterizes all stabilizing controllers using as a parameter an arbitrary stable proper transfer function (matrix).

Theorem 1. Let a plant $P = ND^{-1}$, with N and D coprime over S , be stabilized by a controller (in a negative feedback loop) $C = XY^{-1}$, with X, Y coprime over S . Then the set of all stabilizing controllers for P is given by $\{(X + DQ)(Y - NQ)^{-1} : Q \in S\}$

The idea of Section 2 is included here: suppose P is scalar and stable. Then $N = P, D = 1$. [This pair (N, D)

is coprime]. Also $C = 0$ is stabilizing, so $X = 0, Y = 1$. [The pair (X, Y) is coprime]. Then the formula yields $Q(1 - PQ)^{-1}$, as before in (2.2)

It is certainly not obvious that the above parametrization yields a closed-loop transfer function matrix which is linear in Q ; the calculation is easy when P and C are scalar, and the closed-loop transfer function is computed to be

$$G = \frac{PC}{1 + PC} = \frac{NX}{NX + DY} + \frac{ND}{NX + DY}Q, \quad (3.1)$$

which is affine in Q —the next best thing to linear Q .

In the MIMO case, the result is

$$G = [N \ 0] \begin{bmatrix} I & Q \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D & -X \\ N & Y \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.2)$$

and again the affine property holds. (The inverse will exist if the closed-loop is well-defined, which is the case if both P and C are proper with one strictly proper; the inverse is in \mathcal{S} if the closed-loop is stable). If $\bar{X}, \bar{Y}, \bar{D}$ and \bar{N} are such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{Y} & \bar{X} \\ -\bar{N} & \bar{D} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D & -X \\ N & Y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.3)$$

then (3.2) simplifies significantly to

$$G = N(\bar{X} + Q\bar{D}). \quad (3.4)$$

Digression. Equation (3.3) which is known as the (double) Bezout identity (Vidysagar, 1985), has embedded within it many ideas, a few of which we list here:

- $\bar{D}^{-1}\bar{N}$ and $\bar{Y}^{-1}\bar{X}$ equal ND^{-1} and XY^{-1} , and are left coprime fractional descriptions of the plant and initial stabilizing controller.
- the stability of the plant-controller loop is equivalent to the invertibility (over \mathcal{S}) of each of the matrices on the left of (3.3)
- $(X + DQ)(Y - NQ)^{-1} = (\bar{Y} - Q\bar{N})^{-1}(\bar{X} + Q\bar{D})$

Equations (3.2) and (3.4) show the affine dependence of the closed-loop transfer function (matrix) linking r to y on the parameter $Q(s) \in \mathcal{S}$. It is not hard to verify that the transfer function (matrix) linking either r or d to any of e, u and y are *similarly affine* in $Q(s)$. Of particular interest in many designs are the output sensitivity, viz. the transfer function matrix linking d to y :

$$S(s) = (I + PC)^{-1} = (Y - NQ)\bar{D} \quad (3.5)$$

and the transfer function matrix from the external input r to the plant input u , viz

$$G_{ur}(s) = C(I + PC)^{-1} = (X + DQ)\bar{D}. \quad (3.6)$$

The affine dependence carries over into even more general structures: for example, suppose that there exists




Fig. 2. More general plant-controller interconnection, with disturbances w and regulated variables z

one controller $C(s)$ producing internal stability for the set-up of Figure 2. Here, w denotes the disturbance signals, z the regulated variables, u the actuator inputs and y the sensor outputs (normally including set-point data). Then the set of all controllers achieving internal stability can be parametrised very similarly to the set of Theorem 1 in terms of a free proper $Q(s) \in \mathcal{S}$, and the closed-loop transfer function (matrix) from w to z has the form

$$G_{zw} = T_1(s) + T_2(s)Q(s)T_3(s), \quad (3.7)$$

with T_1, T_2 , and $T_3 \in \mathcal{S}$ [and independent of $Q(s)$].

The formula (3.7) is behind one approach to solving H_∞ problems where the task is to choose Q so that $\|G_{zw}\|_\infty$ lies below a nominated bound, or is minimized see (Zhou *et al.*, 1995) and (Green and Limebeer, 1995). Equally, the formula can be used as a basis for tackling H_2 problems, where the task is to choose Q to minimize $\|G_{zw}\|_2$, see (Doyle *et al.*, 1992).

4. FLOTATION CIRCUIT DESIGN EXAMPLE

The reference (Ross and Swartz, 1995) describes a multivariable system application of the Q -parametrization of a controller to flotation circuit design, the model being like that of Figure 2. In a flotation cell, see Figure 3, a froth is produced through the injection of air, and the froth layer contains a higher proportion of valuable material and a lower proportion of gangue than the feed. It is used to generate the concentrate. Normally, a series of cells are connected, generally with feedback between them.

For an individual cell, the correspondences with Figure 2 are

- u : 2-vector comprising air flowrate and additional water flowrate
- w : change in total feed solids flowrate ($G_f + Z_f$)
- z : concentrate valuable material
- y : same as z

A discrete-time formulation is used, and the i - j element of the matrix Q is




Fig. 3. Flotation cell

$$Q_{ij} = \sum_{k=0}^L q_{ij}(k)z^{-k}. \quad (4.1)$$

Thus an optimization is carried out over a finite-impulse-response (FIR) $Q(z^{-1})$. The quantity optimized is a time-weighted (weight = square of time) sum-of-squares-error of the outputs to a step in a feed disturbance.

$$\Phi = \sum_{r=1}^{NZ} \sum_{s=1}^{ND} W_{rs} \sum_{k=1}^L k^2 [s_{setrs} - s_{rs}(k)]^2. \quad (4.2)$$

Here NZ, ND refer to the dimensions of z and w (for all cells in a bank), W_{rs} is a weighting matrix, $s_{rs}(k)$ is the response at time k of z_r , to a step at time zero in w_s , and $s_{setrs}(k)$ is the corresponding reference value.

Normally, some cells will have their concentrates used as input to other cells. One or more cells will provide the final concentrate, and W_{rs} will reflect the importance attaching to these last cells.

Key to the optimization is the quadratic nature of (4.2) not just in $Q(z^{-1})$, but in the individual parameters $q_{ij}(k)$ making up $Q(z^{-1})$, as well as the finite dimensional nature of the optimization.

5. A MORE ACADEMIC EXAMPLE

The advantage of the affine parametrization is brought out in the following example, (Doyle *et al.*, 1992). The plant, which is to be stabilized with a series compensator in a negative feedback loop, is

$$P = \frac{1}{(s-1)(s-2)} = ND^{-1},$$

$$N = \frac{1}{(s+1)^2},$$

$$D = \frac{(s-1)(s-2)}{(s-1)^2}.$$

The problem is to find a proper $C(s)$ achieving closed-loop stability; also the final value of y is 1 when r is a unit step and $d = 0$, and the final value of y is zero when $r = 0$ and d is a sinusoid of 10 rad/sec.

The Bezout equation $\bar{X}N + \bar{Y}D = 1$ is satisfied by

$$\bar{X} = \frac{19s-11}{s+1}, \quad \bar{Y} = \frac{s+6}{s+1}$$

and one stabilizing controller is given by XY^{-1} with $X = \bar{X}, Y = \bar{Y}$.

A $Q(s)eS$ will ensure closed-loop stability for the controller $C = (X + DQ)(Y - NQ)^{-1}$. The unit step response requirement is that $G(0) = 1$, or by (3.4),

$$Q(0) = 6.$$

The requirement to suppress a sinusoidal output disturbance of 10 rad/sec from (3.5) is

$$S(j10) = 0 \quad \text{or} \\ Q(j10) = -94 + 70j.$$

Since $Q(s)$ is constrained by 3 real interpolation conditions, we can assume

$$Q(s) = \alpha_1 + \frac{\alpha_2}{s+1} + \frac{\alpha_3}{(s+1)^2}$$

and choose α_i to ensure the interpolation data are fulfilled. This leads to a fourth order controller

$$C(s) = \frac{X + DQ}{Y - NQ} \\ = \frac{-60s^4 - 598s^3 + 2515s^2 - 1794s + 1}{s(s^2 + 100)(s+9)}.$$


The denominator zeros of 0 and $\pm j10$ are consistent with the internal model principle and the data.

6. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS OF THE Q PARAMETRIZATION


In earlier sections, we have described material involving the Youla-Kucera parametrization that is reasonably well known. In this section, we look at some more recent developments, including two degrees of freedom controllers, state-variable versions of the earlier ideas, and controller design with constrained closed-loop pole positions.

6.1 Two Degrees of Freedom Controllers

A two degree of freedom arrangements is depicted in Figure 4(a); the specialization $C_1 = C_2 = C$ would recover the scheme of Figure 1. Finding a $Q(s) \in S$ parametrization of all stabilizing C is not hard, using a trick (Moore *et al.*, 1986).



(a) 2-Degree of freedom controller



(b) Equivalent arrangement to Figure 4(a)

Fig. 4.

Work with an augmented plant:

$$P_a(s) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ P(s) \end{bmatrix} = N(s)D^{-1}(s) \quad (6.1)$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ N_2 \end{bmatrix} D^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{D}_2^{-1} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{N}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \bar{D}^{-1}\bar{N}.$$

Suppose a specific controller (in a negative feedback loop) for $P_a(s)$ is

$$[C_1^c(s) \ C_2^c(s)] = \bar{Y}^{-1}[\bar{X}_1 \ \bar{X}_2] = XY^{-1} \quad (6.2)$$

where (3.3) holds. From the fact that $\bar{N}X + \bar{D}Y = I$ and \bar{N} and \bar{D} are structured, we conclude that

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ Y_{12} & Y_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

for some Y_2 .

The set-up of Figure 4(a) is exactly what is obtained when $P_a(s)$ of Figure 4(a) has a series compensator (in a unity negative feedback loop), the first external input is r and the second external input is zero. The first output of $P_a(s)$ is always zero, and the second is y of Figure 4(a). See Figure 4(b). The closed-loop of Figure 4(b) is stable exactly when $C_2(s)$ stabilizes $P(s)$. The set of all stabilizing controllers $[C_1 \ C_2]$ is given, with $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{S}$, by

$$\begin{aligned} & [\bar{Y} - (Q_1 \ Q_2)\bar{N}]^{-1}[(\bar{X}_1 \ \bar{X}_2) + (Q_1 \ Q_2)\bar{D}] \\ &= [\bar{Y} - Q_2\bar{N}_2]^{-1}[\bar{X}_1 + Q_1 \ \bar{X}_2 + Q_2\bar{D}_2]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

Thus the set of $C_2(s)$ is the same as the set of $C(s)$ arising in the one degree of freedom of problem: viz $(\bar{Y} - Q_2\bar{N}_2)^{-1}(\bar{X}_2 + Q_2\bar{D}_2)$ for arbitrary $Q_2 \in \mathcal{S}$: the




Fig. 5. Observer-based stabilizing controller

set of $C_1(s)$ is richer, and contains a further parameter, viz $Q_1 \in \mathcal{S}$. The transfer function from r to y can be computed as

$$G(s) = N_2(\bar{X}_1 + Q_1) \quad (6.4)$$

and the transfer function from d to y is

$$S(s) = (Y_2 - N_2Q_2)\bar{D}_2. \quad (6.5)$$

There is a helpful separation here: Q_1 affects tracking but not disturbance behaviour, and Q_2 affects disturbance but not tracking behaviour.

6.2 Introducing $Q(s)$ into a controller in state-space form

Consider a plant $P(s)$ with minimal realization

$$P(s) = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.6)$$

Let F be such that $\text{Re } \lambda_i(A + BF) < 0$ and H such that $\text{Re } \lambda_i(A + HC) < 0$. It is well-known that an observer-based stabilizing controller is defined by

$$\dot{x}_c = (A + HC)x_c - Hy + BFx_c, \quad (6.7a)$$

$$u = Fx_c. \quad (6.7b)$$

This controller is depicted in Figure 5. Coprime realizations $ND^{-1} = \bar{D}^{-1}\bar{N}$ of the plant and $XY^{-1} = \bar{Y}^{-1}\bar{X}$ of the controller obeying the Bezout identity (3.3) are given by (Nett *et al.*, 1984).

$$\begin{bmatrix} D & -X \\ N & Y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A + BF & B & -H \\ F & I & 0 \\ C & 0 & I \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6.8a)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{Y} & \bar{X} \\ -\bar{N} & \bar{D} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A + HC & -B & H \\ F & I & 0 \\ C & 0 & I \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.8b)$$

(More complicated formulas hold if there are direct feed-through terms present)

It is not hard to verify for Figure 5 that




Fig. 8. Stabilizing controller, using Youla parameter $Q(s)$ and right coprime factorization of nominal controller and of plant

6.3 Pole Positioning in LQG or H_∞ Design

Consider an LQG problem for the plant

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= Fx + Gu + \Gamma w, \\ y &= Hx + v, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{F, G, H\}$ is minimal, and $\{w' \quad v'\}$ is a zero mean, gaussian white noise process with covariance $[Q + R]\delta(t-s)$, where R is nonsingular.

Suppose one is interested in minimizing the expected value of the quadratic index

$$V = \int_{t_0}^{\infty} (x^T Q x + u^T R u) dt,$$

(where $Q = Q' \geq 0$ and all the usual side conditions apply). Suppose also one wishes all closed-loop poles to lie in $\text{Re}[s] < -\alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$. An old device is to replace the index by

$$V_\alpha = \int_{t_0}^{\infty} e^{2\alpha t} (x^T Q x + u^T R u) dt$$

see (Anderson and Moore, 1970). Minimizing the expected value of V_α ensures that all closed-loop poles lie in $\text{Re}[s] < -\alpha$. One can then evaluate $E(V)$ for the design resulting from use of the V_α index. It turns out that on occasions much lower values of $E(V)$ could be achieved from a controller of prescribed order which achieves the closed-loop pole constraint; thus minimizing $E(V_\alpha)$ rather than $E(V)$ may lead to very unsatisfactory results as far as $E(V)$ is concerned.

The Youla-Kucera parametrisation provides an alternative approach, which is closer to minimizing $E(V)$, and which allows a wider choice of closed-loop pole positions (DeBruyne *et al.*, 1995).

Suppose the closed-loop pole positions are required to lie in a domain \mathcal{D} , contained within $\text{Re}[s] < 0$, symmetric with respect to the real axis, and (for technical reasons) containing at least one point on the negative real axis. For example:

$$\mathcal{D} = \{s : \text{Re}[s] < -\alpha, |\text{Im}[s]| \leq \tan\theta |\text{Re}[s]|, \alpha > 0\}.$$

The plant can be represented as a coprime fraction ND^{-1} , where $N, D \in \mathcal{S}_D$, the set of proper rational transfer function matrices with poles in \mathcal{D} . Coprimeness is equivalent to the existence of $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}_D$ with $XN + YD = I$.

Now $\mathcal{S}_D \in \mathcal{S}$, the set of all stable proper transfer functions. Therefore, the result of solving the normal LQG problem with no closed-loop pole constraint other than simple stability will be a stabilizing controller $C(s)$ with fractional description representable as $(X + DQ)(Y - NQ)^{-1}$ for some $Q \in \mathcal{S}$.

Were $Q \in \mathcal{S}_D$, the closed-loop poles will be in \mathcal{D} . In general, $Q \notin \mathcal{S}_D$. However, one can approximate Q by some $Q_D \in \mathcal{S}_D$, and secure thereby approximately the same value of $E(V)$, but with all closed-loop poles in \mathcal{D} . Indeed, if the degree of Q_D can be arbitrarily large, the approximation can be arbitrarily accurate. In general, we do not want the degree of Q_D and thus of $C(s)$ to be arbitrarily large.

The same idea is valid for H_∞ design.

7. PARAMETRIZATION OF THE PLANT AND CLOSED-LOOP IDENTIFICATION

In this section, we first consider the dual question to that treated earlier of how to parametrize all plants (in addition to a nominal one) which are stabilized by a prescribed controller.

In a unity feedback loop with series comparator, with a scalar plant, it is clear that $C(s)$ and $P(s)$ can be interchanged without affecting the closed-loop transfer function. This strongly suggests that there should be an analogous result to Theorem 1 dealing with the set of all plants stabilized by a fixed controller. Indeed, that is so:

Theorem 2. Let a plant $P = ND^{-1}$, with N and D coprime over \mathcal{S} , be stabilized by a (negative feedback) controller $C = XY^{-1}$, with X and Y coprime over \mathcal{S} . Then the set of all plants stabilized by the one controller C is given by $\{(N + YS)(D - XS)^{-1} : S \in \mathcal{S}\}$

There is an extremely important application of this idea, to closed-loop identification in the presence of noise.




Fig. 9. Set-up for open-loop identification




Fig. 10. Set-up for closed-loop identification

7.1 Open and Closed-loop Identification

To motivate the problem, first consider how open-loop identification can be carried out, see Figure 9. In a common scenario, the input process u and noise process n are assumed independent and stationary. The plant is time-invariant and stable, and we can write

$$y = Pu + n. \quad (7.1)$$

Measurements of u and y are available. Many identification schemes for estimating P effectively amount to cross correlating with u and then solving for P :

$$\Phi_{yu}(s) = P(s)\Phi_{uu}(s) + \Phi_{nu}(s) \quad (7.2a)$$

$$= P(s)\Phi_{uu}(s) \quad (7.2b)$$

Of course, (7.2b) follows because u and n are made independent. In actual practice, the calculation may be done in the time-domain, and sample estimates (obtained over a finite interval) may be used instead of true expectations, etc., but the basic principle is the same.

Now consider the stable closed loop of Figure 10, with r and n independent processes. The task is to identify $P(s)$ from measurements which do not include s . Equations (7.1) and (7.2a) remain true. However (7.2b) is replaced by

$$\Phi_{yu}(s) = P(s)\Phi_{uu}(s) - (1 + C^*P^*)^{-1}C^*\Phi_{nn}. \quad (7.3)$$

Evidently, the task of obtaining $P(s)$ is considerably more complicated. Also, even if Φ_{nu} is very small, software packages may be predicated on an assumption that $P(s)$ is stable, which need not be so.

One can of course seek to identify the closed-loop transfer function $G = PC(1 + PC)^{-1}$ from

$$\Phi_{yr} = G\Phi_{rr} \quad (7.4)$$

and then since $P = \frac{G}{C(1-G)}$, one chooses an estimate \hat{P} of P in terms of an estimate \hat{G} of G as




Fig. 11. Alternative representation of noise-contaminated plant

$$\hat{P} = \frac{\hat{G}}{C(1-\hat{G})}. \quad (7.5)$$

The nonlinearity is regarded as an unpleasant feature.

A clever resolution of these difficulties was obtained independently in (Chakravarty and Moore, 1986; Hansen, 1989; Hansen *et al.*, 1989; Schrama, 1991).

Suppose that the controller $C(s)$ is specified as $\bar{Y}^{-1}\bar{X}$ where $\bar{X}, \bar{Y} \in \mathcal{S}$ are coprime. Then by the coprimeness there exist $N, D \in \mathcal{S}$ with

$$\bar{X}N + \bar{Y}D = I. \quad (7.6)$$

This means that $P_o(s) = ND^{-1}$ is one plant (a "nominal" plant) stabilized by $C(s)$. (alternatively, one may start with a representation ND^{-1} of the nominal $P_o(s)$ and then choose that particular representation $\bar{Y}^{-1}\bar{X}$ of the known stabilizing $C(s)$ so that (7.6) holds). The set of all plants stabilized by $C(s)$ is given by

$$\{[N(s) + Y(s)S(s)][D(s) - X(s)S(s)]^{-1} : S \in \mathcal{S}\}. \quad (7.7)$$

Here, XY^{-1} is a coprime right fractional representation of $C(s)$.

Suppose that $\bar{D}^{-1}\bar{N}$ is a left coprime realization of the nominal $P_o(s)$ so that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{Y} & \bar{X} \\ -\bar{N} & \bar{D} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D & -X \\ N & Y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7.8)$$

Then it is not hard to check that the set up of Figure 11, with inputs u and n and output y , implies

$$y = Pu + n,$$

where P is given by (7.7).

Now the key identification idea is to identify S in the first instance, rather than P . The perhaps surprising and pleasing aspect is that the identification of S is a standard open-loop identification problem. To see this, observe from Figure 12 that




Fig. 12. Detail of closed-loop identification

$$\begin{aligned}(D - XS)x &= u + X(\bar{D} - S\bar{X})n \\ &= r_2 + \bar{Y}^{-1}\bar{X}r_1 - \bar{Y}^{-1}\bar{X}y \\ &\quad + X(\bar{D} - S\bar{X})n \quad \text{and} \\ (N + YS)x &= y - Y(\bar{D} - S\bar{X})n.\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying the first equation by \bar{Y} and the second by \bar{X} and adding yields

$$x = \bar{X}r_1 + \bar{Y}r_2. \quad (7.9)$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned}Dx &= u + Xz, \\ Nx &= y - Yz.\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying the first equation by \bar{N} , and the second by \bar{D} and subtracting yields

$$z = \bar{D}y - \bar{N}u, \quad (7.10)$$

while also direct inspection of Figure 12 shows that

$$z = Sx + (\bar{D} - S\bar{X})n. \quad (7.11)$$

Observe in (7.11) that (i) x and y are available from measurements on the closed-loop systems (via (7.9) and (7.10)). (ii) if $n(\cdot)$ is independent of $r_1(\cdot)$ and $r_2(\cdot)$, then in (7.11) $x(\cdot)$ and $n(\cdot)$ are independent processes (iii) S is stable, via the Youla-Kucera theory. Hence the identification of S is a standard open-loop identification problem. So, for that matter, is the identification of a shaping filter, which when driven by white noise, will generate n .

The blocks in Figure 11, apart from S , are associated with right coprime realizations of a nominal plant and a controller stabilizing the nominal and the true plant. It is also possible to work with left coprime realizations. Figure 13 depicts a representation of the plant using $\bar{X}, \bar{Y}, \bar{N}$ and \bar{D} instead of X, Y, N and D . The signals labelled x and z and blocks labelled S in Figures 11 and 13 are the same, in that

$$\begin{aligned}P(s) &= (N + YS)(D - XS)^{-1} = \\ &(\bar{D} - S\bar{X})^{-1}(\bar{N} + S\bar{Y})\end{aligned}$$




Fig. 13. Second alternative realization of noise-contaminated plant

and for both schemes, (7.9) and (7.11) are valid when the plant is connected in a feedback loop with controller $XY^{-1} = \bar{Y}^{-1}\bar{X}$.

Since there is not a convenient replacement of (7.9) and (7.11) in which entities associated with right rather than left coprime realization appear, it is perhaps tidier to work with the scheme of Figure 13 than that of Figure 11.

A number of other points should be made:

- (1) If $P(s)$ is known a priori to be strictly proper, and $P_o(s)$ is strictly proper, $S(s)$ must have this property, and conversely;
- (2) Suppose that for identification purposes a finitely-parametrized model set $\{S_{\alpha}, \alpha \in A\}$ is adopted and one obtains S_{α^*} as some sort of best approximation to S . Let $P_{\alpha^*}(s)$ be the corresponding approximation to $P(s)$. Then it can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned}PC(I + PC)^{-1} - P_{\alpha^*}C(I + P_{\alpha^*}C)^{-1} \\ = Y(S - S_{\alpha^*})\bar{X} \quad (7.12)\end{aligned}$$

and if $r_2 = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}[PC(I + PC)^{-1} - P_{\alpha^*}C(I + P_{\alpha^*}C)^{-1}]r \\ = Y(S - S_{\alpha^*})x. \quad (7.13)\end{aligned}$$

In both equations, the left hand side is a modelling error associated with a closed-loop transfer function. The right hand side is the open-loop modelling error associated with S , using a frequency weight Y .

A particular version of these formulas results when S_{α^*} is replaced by 0, corresponding to the nominal plant.

Then

$$PC(I + PC)^{-1} - P_oC(I + P_oC)^{-1} = YS\bar{X}, \quad (7.14)$$

$$[PC(I + PC)^{-1} - P_oC(I + P_oC)^{-1}]r = YSr. \quad (7.15)$$

The expressions relate S to a closed-loop quantity.

(3) One can also note that

$$P - P_o = \bar{D}^{-1}S(D - XS)^{-1}, \quad (7.16)$$

which shows that a frequency weighted version of S yields the open-loop error between P and P_o ; one of the weights depends itself on S .

(4) The identification of a P through P_o and then S can give rise to a possibly large degree for P . If subsequent identifications refine knowledge of P even further, the degree may increase at each identification step. For this reason, it often makes sense to do an order reduction of an identified P . Since it is the closed-loop obtained by using P with C which is relevant, one seeks a low order \hat{P} so that a quantity such as the following is minimized:

$$\|PC(I + PC)^{-1} - \hat{P}C(I + \hat{P}C)^{-1}\|_{\infty}.$$

This is approximately (neglecting second order error terms)

$$\|(I + PC)^{-1}(P - \hat{P})C(I + PC)^{-1}\|_{\infty}$$

and a frequency weighted model reduction problem is to be tackled.

(5) It can be argued that a normalized coprime realization of P_o is best used (VandenHof *et al.*, 1995). One of the reasons for this is as follows. Let N, D be a normalized right coprime realization pair of P_o , so that $N_*N + D_*D = I$. Let \hat{P} be any other plant, with any right coprime realization pair \hat{N}, \hat{D} . Define the directed distance from P_o to P by

$$\bar{\delta}(P_o, P) = \inf_{U \in \mathcal{S}} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} N \\ D \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \hat{N} \\ \hat{D} \end{bmatrix} U \right\|_{\infty}.$$

Let

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} P_o C(I + P_o C)^{-1} & P_o(I + C P_o)^{-1} \\ (I + C P_o)^{-1} C & (I + C P_o)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{\infty} = \gamma^{-1}.$$

Then C stabilizes all P with $\bar{\delta}(P_o, P) < \gamma$, (Georgiou and Smith, 1990).

Now suppose that we use the identification procedure for P described above. In the presence of noise, it may not yield the correct S , but rather some \hat{S} . Let the associated plant be designated by \hat{P} . If (N, D) is normalized, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\delta}(P_o, \hat{P}) &= \inf_{U \in \mathcal{S}} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} N \\ D \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} N + Y\hat{S} \\ D - X\hat{S} \end{bmatrix} U \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} N \\ D \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} N + Y\hat{S} \\ D - X\hat{S} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{\infty} \\ &= \left\| \begin{pmatrix} Y \\ X \end{pmatrix} \hat{S} \right\|_{\infty} \end{aligned}$$

We know that C stabilizes P (by experiment), stabilizes P_o (by calculation) and stabilizes \hat{P} (by the theorem

on Youla-Kucera parametrization). However, a condition like

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} Y \\ X \end{pmatrix} \hat{S} \right\|_{\infty} > \gamma^{-1}$$

is a flag that $\bar{\delta}(P_o, \hat{P})$ may also exceed γ^{-1} , so that the difference between P_o and \hat{P} is in some sense substantial; redesign of a controller should therefore proceed cautiously.

7.2 Noisy Identification

We have explained that the basis of the identification problem is to use (7.11). It is important to consider at any one frequency what the signal-to-noise ratio is, and how it is related to quantities in the original actual and model closed-loop.

For simplicity, suppose $r_2 = 0$ and that plant and controller are scalar. Thus $\bar{D} = D, \bar{N} = N$ etc. Then in (7.11), the signal-to-noise ratio is

$$\left| \frac{S}{D - SX} \right|^2 \frac{\Phi_{xx}}{\Phi_{nn}} = \left| \frac{SX}{D - SX} \right|^2 \frac{\Phi_{r_1 r_1}}{\Phi_{nn}}.$$

(Here Φ is a generic symbol used to denote a spectrum). It is not hard to check the error between that part of the actual closed-loop output due to r_1 and the model output is

$$\left(\frac{PC}{1 + PC} - \frac{P_o C}{1 + P_o C} \right) r_1 = SXYr_1,$$

while the noisy component of the actual closed-loop output is $\frac{1}{1 + PC}n = (D - XS)Yn$.

The associated signal to noise ratio is then

$$\left| \frac{\text{tracking error "signal"}}{\text{Noise}} \right|^2 = \left| \frac{SX}{D - SX} \right|^2 \frac{\Phi_{r_1 r_1}}{\Phi_{nn}},$$

which is the same quantity. This is an important observation, further legitimising the use of open-loop equivalent scheme.

7.3 Windsurfer Approach to Adaptive Control

The ideas of Section 7.1 are crucial to the development of a methodology for adaptive control which is much less based on identifying numerator and denominator coefficients in plant or controller transfer functions than in an iterative identification and controller design scheme, tied to the frequency domain. (Lee *et al.*, 1992; Lee *et al.*, 1993; Lee *et al.*, 1995).

The original motivation was to do adaptive control robustly, ie. without incurring “temporary” instability in the learning phase. By way of example, conventional adaptive control can encounter substantial difficulty if there are high frequency dynamics in the true plant not reflected in an a priori model of the plant, and possibly not even capable of being reflected by adjusting coefficients in the a priori model, due to too low a degree having been adopted for it.

Windsurfer adaptive control was first developed for open-loop stable plants (permitted though to have a pole or poles at the origin). The key idea (as when a human learns windsurfing) is to initially use a controller defining a very small closed-loop bandwidth; design of this controller requires almost no more prior knowledge than the sign of the DC gain of the plant.

A series of redesigns of the controller is then effected, each pushing out the closed-loop bandwidth some more. At some stage, predicted and actual closed-loop performance becomes clearly different; at this point, the plant is better identified using the scheme of Section 7.1. This new identification will then cause the closed-loop transfer function obtained using the new model of the plant and that obtained using the actual model of the plant to be far more similar. In effect, knowledge of the plant is developed over a wider bandwidth than previously (with the quality of that knowledge linked to closed-loop rather than open-loop behaviour).

With the re-identified plant, the controller design is then adjusted, progressively expanding the closed-loop bandwidth until again there is divergence between behaviour as predicted by the model and the actual behaviour. A further (closed-loop) identification is executed, thereby further widening the bandwidth over which the plant is adequately described (for the purpose of closed-loop control). Once again, closed-loop bandwidth is expanded via a series of controller design, and so on.

The procedure thus gives rise to a sequence of (strictly) proper stable plant models, $\{G_0, G_1, \dots\}$ and for each model G_i , there is a sequence of controllers $K_i^0, K_i^1, \dots, K_i^f$ giving progressively larger bandwidths for the closed-loop transfer function $G_i K_i^j (I + G_i K_i^j)^{-1}$.

A great number of important questions arise:

- Is there a scheme for progressively increasing the closed-loop bandwidth? Yes, for stable plants at least. The IMC method (Morari and Zafriou, 1989) is ideal, allowing direct control over closed-loop bandwidth.
- When can the closed-loop bandwidth be increased with safety, ie. without losing stability, while retaining use of the (possibly inaccurate) model G ?

There can be no sudden onset of instability that is not preceded at a somewhat lesser design bandwidth by significant difference between predicted and actual closed-loop behaviour.

- What *would we like* to identify, in order that with the new model, performance of the closed-loop system can be improved through controller redesign? It turns out that we would like to replace the model G_i by a model G_{i+1} so that, with G the true plant and \bar{T}_{i+1} the designed closed-loop,

$$\left\| \frac{G - G_{i+1} \bar{T}_{i+1}}{G_{i+1}} \right\|_{\infty} < 1,$$

and

$$\left| \frac{G - G_{i+1} \bar{T}_{i+1}}{G_{i+1}} \right|,$$

is small for all frequencies above the *lesser* of the bandwidth of \bar{T}_{i+1} and the smallest frequency corresponding to zeros of G_{i+1} in $\text{Re}[s] \geq 0$.

- What *can we identify* (as opposed to what would we like to identify)? As we know, we can identify a Youla-Kucera parameter S , albeit in the presence of noise. However, we can only identify it accurately if a certain signal-to-noise ratio is high. “Signal” is the error between that part of the true plant output which is due to input excitations and the model output (which is due solely to input excitations). “Noise” is that part of the plant output arising from disturbances. The signal-to-noise ratio is only likely to be high in certain frequency ranges. Further, as pointed out in the last subsection, it is this signal-to-noise ratio that is also directly relevant in the open-loop identification of the Youla-Kucera parameter S .
- When will there be a significantly high signal-to-noise ratio allowing identification of S in a frequency band? The instinctive answer is almost correct: there must be a failure of the model to correctly predict closed-loop performance of the controller with the true plant. But there is a surprise qualification. Nonminimum phase zeros in the pass-band of the plant and/or model can mean that noise disturbances cannot be well cancelled by the controller. Then “signal” and noise can be high but the *ratio* may not be high, and reidentifiability is hard.

Roughly speaking it turns out that what we want to identify and what we can identify coincide, until nonminimum phase zeros appear in the closed-loop pass-band. Then the scheme will come to a stop in this situation; it may also stop when the open-loop bandwidth of the true plant is exceeded by the proposed design bandwidth, so that unreasonably large plant inputs are demanded.

Some important points should be made.

- (1) The initial model may be very low order, even if it is suspected that the plant has high frequency resonances.
- (2) The scheme does not permit instabilities to occur, nor for that matter adverse transient behaviour; the latter especially is a concern for conventional adaptive control schemes, especially if there are unknown high frequency resonances in the plant.
- (3) Generally, the Youla-Kucera parameter in the plant re-identification step need only be of order 2-4, since a modest adjustment of the model applicable over a limited bandwidth is what is required.
- (4) If the true plant is unstable, control of closed-loop bandwidth by adjustment of a single parameter in the IMC design scheme is not straightforward. Also, it may be hard to find an initially stabilizing controller. Only preliminary work has been done on the adaptive control scheme for such plants.

8. YOULA-KUCERA PARAMETERS IN PLANT AND CONTROLLER

We have so far dealt with a set of controllers stabilizing one plant, and a set of plants stabilized by one controller. We are now going to mix these themes.

8.1 The Stability Issue

We begin with a question. Consider a nominal plant-controller pair, $P^\circ(s) = N(s)D^{-1}(s) = \bar{D}^{-1}(s)\bar{N}(s)$ and $C^\circ(s) = X(s)Y^{-1}(s) = \bar{Y}^{-1}(s)\bar{X}(s)$. We assume that N, D etc are elements of \mathcal{S} and

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{Y} & \bar{X} \\ -\bar{N} & \bar{D} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D & -X \\ N & Y \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8.1)$$

For what pairs $Q(s), S(s) \in \mathcal{S}$ will the plant $P(s) = [N(s) + Y(s)S(s)][D(s) - X(s)S(s)]^{-1}$ and controller $C(s) = [X(s) + D(s)Q(s)][Y(s) - N(s)Q(s)]^{-1}$ define a stable closed-loop? The answer is (Tay *et al.*, 1989)

Theorem 3. Let $P^\circ = ND^{-1} = \bar{D}^{-1}\bar{N}$ and $C^\circ = XY^{-1} = \bar{Y}^{-1}\bar{X}$ with (8.1) holding and N, D etc. $\in \mathcal{S}$ define a stable unity negative feedback closed-loop. Then $P = [N + YS][D - XS]^{-1}$ and $C = [X + DQ][Y - NQ]^{-1}$ for S and $Q \in \mathcal{S}$ defines a stable unity negative feedback closed-loop if and only if S and Q together define a stable loop.

Proof P and C will form a stable loop if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} D - XS & -X - DQ \\ N + YS & Y - NQ \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \in \mathcal{S} \\ & \Leftrightarrow \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} D & -X \\ N & Y \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & -Q \\ S & I \end{bmatrix} \right\}^{-1} \in \mathcal{S} \\ & \Leftrightarrow \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} I & -Q \\ S & I \end{bmatrix} \right\}^{-1} \in \mathcal{S}, \end{aligned}$$

which holds if and only if S and Q together define a stable loop.

Note that the fact that $S, Q \in \mathcal{S}$ is not used. Note also that it is not hard to vary the above argument to show that generically the closed-loop poles of the $P(s), C(s)$ system are the union of those of the $P^\circ(s), C^\circ(s)$ systems and the S, Q system, (Tay *et al.*, 1989). \square

The above result raises the following issue. Suppose a controller design has been achieved for a nominal plant, and then more information concerning the plant becomes available (ie. $S(s)$ is learnt, at least approximately). How should the controller be adjusted? Equivalently, how should $Q(s)$ be chosen?

At the broadest level, the answer depends on the design criterion, and we look at two (LQG and H_∞) below. Of course, one could imagine repeating a whole design process with a new $P(s)$ (involving $S(s)$), obtaining $C(s)$, from which one could then devise $Q(s)$. This however is not the point of the question; the key idea is to see whether $Q(s)$ could be obtained from $S(s)$ via some simple formula. Thus we could imagine that if the nominal $P^\circ(s)$ and $C^\circ(s)$ were of high order, 40 say, and $S(s)$ was second order (associated with the inclusion of a further resonant mode in $P(s)$ for example), then $Q(s)$ might be second order also. The discussion of closed-loop poles above shows that if their positions are the prime concerns, one could proceed in exactly this way, ie. computing $Q(s)$ directly from $S(s)$.

8.2 LQG Design

The problem of relating a plant perturbation through to a controller perturbation for LQ design is treated in (Anderson *et al.*, 1994). We shall indicate here simply the nature of the answer. First, it is only possible to get a simple relationship between S and Q when S is small. Then the form of the result is (for a scalar plant)

$$Q \simeq A^{-1}[A^{-*}S^*DD^*\Phi]_{stable}. \quad (8.2)$$

In this formula, A is the minimum phase spectral factor of an entity formed in solving the LQ problem for P° and C° , $X^*(s)$ denotes $X(-s)$, Φ is the spectrum of the exciting noises (and may be white), and $[Z]_{stable}$ denotes the stable part of a partial fraction expansion of Z .

This formula has not been reworked using state variable calculations to try to relate the degrees of S and Q .

Retaining the assumption of small S , it is possible to obtain an expression for the change in quadratic cost. It is of the form

$$\text{cost change} \simeq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int [B_*Q + Q_*B] d\omega. \quad (8.3)$$

where B depends on P° and C° .

A second approach to LQ design is set out in (Tay *et al.*, 1989). A design for P° is done to yield C° . Then a separate design for S is done to yield Q ; the input and output of S appear in the index. No real guidance is given as to how to select weights for this second problem, although it is argued that for the second problem, having constant rather than frequency dependent weights gives an index which is logical in terms of the original objective of minimizing through choice of $C(s)$ a quadratic index involving $P(s)$.

The degree of $Q(s)$ is effectively that of $S(s)$, which is an advantage. An example in (Tay *et al.*, 1989) shows the efficacy of the approach.

It would certainly be of interest to quantify the loss of optimality of a design achieved by the two step procedure [P° gives C° and S gives Q] in comparison with an optimal design [P gives C].

8.3 H_∞ Design

The set-up here starts with a generalized plant

$$P^\circ(s) = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11}(s) & P_{12}(s) \\ P_{21}(s) & P_{22}(s) \end{bmatrix} \quad (8.4)$$

of the type shown in Figure 2 and an associated H_∞ controller $C^\circ(s)$. We suppose that $P_{22}^\circ = ND^{-1} = \bar{D}^{-1}\bar{N}$ and $C^\circ = XY^{-1} = \bar{Y}^{-1}\bar{X}$, with the usual Bezout equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{Y} & \bar{X} \\ -\bar{N} & \bar{D} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D & -X \\ N & Y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}.$$

[Note the sign convention in Figure 2 allows us to regard $P_{22}^\circ(s)$ and C° as forming a unity negative feedback loop]. All standard conditions for solvability of the H_∞ problem are assumed to be fulfilled and also in the original reference (Yan and Moore, 1993) P_{12} and P_{21} are assumed stable, though this seems unnecessary if all unstable modes of $P^\circ(s)$ appear in $P_{22}^\circ(s)$.

Suppose now that P_{22}° is replaced by $P_{22} = (N+YS)(D-XS)^{-1}$ and let $P(S)$ denote the corresponding generalized plant. Then there is a clever way of choosing $Q(s)$,

as follows. Define a second generalized plant involving S alone, by

$$P^S = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11}^S(s) & P_{12}^S(s) \\ P_{21}^S(s) & P_{22}^S(s) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & S \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} S \\ I \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} I & -S \end{bmatrix} & S \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8.5)$$

Let $F_L(P, C)$ denote the system arising from interconnecting a generalized plant P with a controller C , as illustrated in Figure 2. Then (Yan and Moore, 1993)

$$\|F_L(P(S), C(Q)) - F_L(P^\circ, C^\circ)\|_\infty \leq \alpha \|F_L(P^S, Q)\|_\infty, \quad (8.6)$$

where

$$\alpha = \|P_{12}[D \quad -X]\|_\infty \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \bar{X} \\ \bar{D} \end{bmatrix} P_{21} \right\|_\infty. \quad (8.7)$$

Evidently, the idea is to choose Q to keep the right side of (8.6) small; then there is supposed to be good matching on the left side. The expression $F_L(P^S, Q)$ evaluates as

$$F_L(P^S, Q) = \begin{bmatrix} SQ(I-SQ)^{-1} & (I-SQ)^{-1}S \\ Q(I-SQ)^{-1} & -(I-QS)^{-1}QS \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is undoubtedly clear that if $\|S\|_\infty$ is small then Q can be chosen with $\|Q\|_\infty$ small and $\|F_L(P^S, Q)\|_\infty$ also small. What is not clear is how much damage the multiplier α could do. An examination of (Yan and Moore, 1993) shows that α is a crude bounding quantity; it may be possible to improve on the bound, and/or it may be possible to identify structures where α is guaranteed to be small.

The above has one clear advantage; finding Q knowing S does not involve $P^\circ(s)$ or $C^\circ(s)$, and the degrees of Q and S will be comparable if Q is found via H_∞ methods.

8.4 Indirect Adaptive Control

The potential for indirect adaptive control using the ideas of this and the previous section should be clear. Methods tackling closed loop identification by reduction to an open-loop problem allow correction of a nominal plant model $P^\circ(s)$ by a stable $S(s)$; then a pole-positioning, LQG or H_∞ approach allows derivation of a $Q(s)$, (Tay *et al.*, 1989). Of course, $S(s)$ can be slowly varying, requiring on-line technology. Then $Q(s)$ must be subject also to update.

8.5 Open Issues

A key question raised at the start of this section was: how should the adjustment $Q(s)$ of a controller be determined, knowing an adjustment $S(s)$ of the plant. The answers to this point have been incomplete:

- pole positioning. The incompleteness arises because, firstly, pole positioning by itself is a limited design objective and secondly, the result is only generic.
- LQG. The incompleteness also arises because either one stays with the original performance index and then only gets simplification, albeit limited, when adjustments are small; or one uses a different performance index for the S-Q optimization, which cannot give an overall optimal result.
- H_∞ : The incompleteness arises because of an inequality in the key result, and an appearance of a constant α with rather unclear intuitive content. In particular, even if an H_∞ controller $C(Q)$ exists for a plant $P(S)$ (to achieve internal stability and a given performance level), there is no guarantee that one can find it by using an index based on a plant P^S (determined solely by S) and a feedback controller Q .

Stabilizing $P(S)$ with $C(Q)$ knowing that P° is stabilized by C° is completely equivalent to stabilizing S with Q ; thus there is a decoupling of the stability problem for $P(S)$, $C(Q)$ into two, namely P°, C° and S, Q . Unfortunately, there is less tidy decoupling as soon as one introduces other goals of control apart from stability, and there may still be much scope for improving the decoupling. Two ideas which should be explored are the use of normalized coprime realizations, and consideration of S which have significant values of $\|S(j\omega)\|$ only where $P^\circ(j\omega)$ is approximately constant or even very small, thereby offering scope for a decoupling in the frequency domain that could feed through into the performance objectives.

9. NONLINEAR SYSTEMS

Many of the ideas applicable to linear systems can be carried over to nonlinear systems, but a number cannot. Research aimed at establishing just what is possible is in fact very active.

Before illustrating the role of a Youla-Kucera parameter, it is however necessary to understand how the concepts of right and left coprime realization arise.

We begin with right coprime realizations, and we shall drive that idea as far as possible before introducing the appropriate nonlinear generalization of a left coprime realization. We shall see that Youla-Kucera parametrization results using right coprime realization of nonlinear systems clearly fall short of those for the linear case.




Fig. 14. Representation of nonlinear system to allow generation of right factorization

9.1 Right coprime realizations

We begin with a system Σ , possessing a set of input signals \mathcal{U} (a subset of the time-functions from $[0, \infty)$ to R^k , k being the system input dimension) and a set of output signals \mathcal{Y} (a subset of the time-functions from $[0, \infty)$ to R^l , l being the output dimension). We shall identify a subset of \mathcal{U} , call it \mathcal{U}^s , with the set of stable input signals; often \mathcal{U}^s is $L_2^k[0, \infty)$. \mathcal{Y}^s is similarly defined. Stable systems are those which map \mathcal{U}^s to \mathcal{Y}^s (causally) for any internal condition.

We say that Σ has a (stable) right factorization if there exists a set of time functions \mathcal{W} with stable subset \mathcal{W}^s and stable operators $D: \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ and $N: \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ with D invertible such that $\Sigma = ND^{-1}$. If the initial state is not zero, Σ should be parametrized by $x(0) = x_0$.

The factorization is termed right coprime if for all unbounded $w \in \mathcal{W}$, either Nw or Dw is also unbounded, or equivalently if $Nw \in \mathcal{Y}^s$ and $Dw \in \mathcal{U}^s$ imply $w \in \mathcal{W}^s$.

A sufficient condition for this property is that there exists a bounded operator $L: \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ such that

$$L \begin{bmatrix} N \\ D \end{bmatrix} = I. \quad (9.1)$$

Note there is no requirement for L to be separable, in the sense that

$$L(u, y) = L_1(u) + L_2(y).$$

Such separability would imply

$$L_1N + L_2D = I,$$

which is reminiscent of a necessary and sufficient condition for coprimeness in the linear case. Of course, if L is known to be a linear operator, it automatically has the separability property.

Example 1. Consider the system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= f(x) + g(x)u, \\ y &= h(x), \end{aligned} \quad (9.2)$$

with $f(0) = 0, h(0) = 0$, and suppose that the control law $u = k(x) + v$ yields a stable closed-loop system from w to y . Figure 14 is a redrawing of the system, adding and subtracting a feedback $k(x)$. The operators N and D are defined by

$$D^{-1} : u \rightarrow w. \begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(x) + g(x)u, \\ w = u - k(x) \end{cases} \quad (9.3)$$

or

$$D : w \rightarrow u. \begin{cases} \dot{x} = [f(x) + g(x)k(x)] + g(x)w, \\ u = k(x) + w \end{cases} \quad (9.4)$$

and

$$N : w \rightarrow y. \begin{cases} \dot{x} = [f(x) + g(x)k(x)] + g(x)w, \\ y = h(x). \end{cases} \quad (9.5)$$

Is the realization coprime? Under an observability condition, it is. Suppose w is unknown, but the associated $u(\cdot) = Dw(\cdot)$ and $y(\cdot) = Nw(\cdot)$ are known. Observability allows the recovery of $x(\cdot)$ from $u(\cdot)$ and $y(\cdot)$; then $w(\cdot)$ can be recovered - see the second equation of (9.3); thus observability is equivalent to the existence of the operator L in (9.1).

Example 2. (Scherpen and van der Schaft, 1994; VandenHof *et al.*, 1995) consider the same system as that of Example 1, and suppose that there is a state feedback law which minimises the index

$$\int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} [u^T u + h^T(x)h(x)] dt$$

for the system. Suppose further that with initial condition x_0 , the minimized value of the index is $V(x_0) \geq 0$, with $V(0) = 0$ and

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial x} f - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} g g^T \frac{\partial^T V}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{2} h h^T = 0. \quad (9.6)$$

(This is the standard Hamilton-Jacobi equation associated with the problem). Then we define $\begin{bmatrix} N \\ D \end{bmatrix}$ by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(x) - g(x)g^T(x) \frac{\partial^T V}{\partial x} + g(x)w, \\ y = h(x), \\ u = -g^T(x) \frac{\partial^T V}{\partial x} + w. \end{cases} \quad (9.7)$$

Notice that this is a special case of Example 1; with the observability assumption that $\dot{x} = f(x)$ and $h(x) \equiv 0$ implies $x \equiv 0$, the stabilizing property of the feedback law can be proved using the Hamilton-Jacobi equation [The Lyapunov function for the unforced system is $V(x)$]. The Hamilton-Jacobi equation also is the basis for establishing that

$$\int_0^{\infty} (u^T u + y^T y) dt = \int_0^{\infty} w^T w dt.$$

This establishes coprimeness of the factorization, and in fact establishes that the factorization is a nonlinear equivalent of normalized, with unity gain from w to $\begin{bmatrix} u^T & y^T \end{bmatrix}^T$




Fig. 15. Nonlinear plant-controller interconnection

Defining an explicit operator L satisfying (9.1) requires a further assumption, regarding the dual Hamilton-Jacobi equation (which is associated with the problem of transferring from $x(-\infty) = 0$ to a prescribed x_0 , and minimizing $\int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{1}{2} [u^T u + h^T(x)h(x)] dt$). Let $W(x) \geq 0$, $W(0) = 0$ satisfy

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial x} f + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial W}{\partial x} g g^T \frac{\partial W^T}{\partial x} - \frac{1}{2} h^T h = 0. \quad (9.8)$$

Assume additionally that there exists a $k_e(\cdot)$ such that

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial x} k_e(x) = h^T(x). \quad (9.9)$$

We use it to define an operator L by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{p} = [f(p) - k_e(p)h(p)] + g(p)u + k_e(p)y, \\ \zeta = g^T(p) \frac{\partial V^T}{\partial p}(p) + u, \\ p(0) = x(0). \end{cases} \quad (9.10)$$

The stability of L is established using the Hamilton-Jacobi equation for W , with $W(p)$ a Lyapunov function for the unforced equation. The cascade of (9.7) and (9.10) results in $p(t) = x(t)$ for all T and then $\zeta(t) = w(t)$ for all t .

Note that while the signals $u(\cdot)$ and $y(\cdot)$ enter L linearly, the nonlinearity of L ensures that we cannot decompose the output $L(u, y)$ as $L_1(u) + L_2(y)$.

The examples reveal that a wide class of finite-dimensional nonlinear systems have a right coprime factorization. This motivates us to consider interconnections of plants and controllers, both with right coprime factorization.

9.2 Plant-Controller Interconnections

Figure 15 illustrates a plant-controller interconnection, which we assume to be well-posed i.e. w_1, w_2 exist and depend causally on r_1, r_2 when the latter are respectively behaved time functions. Evidently

$$\begin{pmatrix} r_1 \\ r_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I & -C \\ P & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and the closed-loop is stable (in the obvious sense) just when

$$\begin{pmatrix} I & -C \\ P & I \end{pmatrix}^{-1}$$

exists and is bounded. (Existence of the inverse is a requirement for w_1, w_2 to exist; obviously, we could have chosen as outputs the outputs of C and P instead of w_1, w_2 without significantly changing the conclusion).

The following result connects the stability to right coprime factorization.

Theorem 4. (Paice et al., 1992) Suppose that $P = ND^{-1}$ and $C = XY^{-1}$ are right coprime factorizations. The the closed-loop is well posed if

$$\begin{bmatrix} D & -X \\ N & Y \end{bmatrix}^{-1}$$

exists and the closed-loop is stable if and only if this inverse is a bounded operator. (If the inverse is known to be stable for any plant and controller right factorizations, but not necessarily coprime, coprimeness of the factorization is automatically implied).

The proof is very simple and most can be included. Observe that

$$\begin{pmatrix} I & -C \\ P & I \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} D & 0 \\ 0 & Y \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} D & -X \\ N & Y \end{pmatrix}^{-1}$$

If the second operator on the right is bounded, that on the left must be bounded. For the converse, suppose that

$$\begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} D & -X \\ N & Y \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} r_1 \\ r_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

with r_i bounded, one of z_i at least unbounded (say z_1) and $w_1 = Dz_1$ and $w_2 = Yz_2$ bounded. Since $Nz_1 + Yz_2 = r_2$, Nz_1 is bounded; with Nz_1 and Dz_1 , bounded, coprimeness requires z_1 to be bounded, a contradiction.

9.3 Characterizing the Stabilizing Controllers for an open-loop stable plant

We can now exhibit a Youla parameter for an open-loop stable plant, using ideas of (Paice and der Schaft, 1995a). The result is just like that for the linear case, given in Section 2.

Consider the scheme of Figure 16; the controller is composed of an interconnection of an arbitrary stable operator Q and a model of the plant P . It is assumed that the initial state of the model and of the plant itself are the same. It is then evident that $y = PQr$, so that C , given by

$$C = Q(I - PQ)^{-1} \quad (9.11)$$




Fig. 16. With stable P , all stabilizing controllers are given by stable Q

is stabilizing. (Note: the derivation of this formula is somewhat nontrivial in the nonlinear case). To express Q in terms of C and P , we have

$$Q = C(I + PC)^{-1}. \quad (9.12)$$

[This formula is not straightforward to derive by manipulation from (9.11); it can be substituted into (9.11) and the result verified. Alternatively, one can observe using Figure 16 that Q follows from C by connecting P in a negative feedback loop, to undo the P in the positive feedback loop generating C from Q].

To establish that any stabilising C necessarily can be represented in the manner depicted, observe that if C is stabilizing, then $\hat{Q} = C(I + PC)^{-1}$ is stable (this is the operator from r to u). This formula can be inverted to yield $C = \hat{Q}(I - P\hat{Q})^{-1}$, as required.

Actually, there is a substantial concealed deficiency in the above argument. Suppose there is an additional external input r_1 entering between C and P . It is not possible to ensure that the state of the actual plant and that of the model within the controller are the same. Accordingly, the earlier argument cannot be carried through.

All is not lost however. If P has a Lipschitz continuity property, one can write (with u the controller output)

$$P(u + r_1) = Pu + y_1 \quad (9.13)$$

where y_1 obeys $\|y_1\| \leq K\|r_1\|$ for some K . Then the scheme of Figure 16 applies again, with r replaced by $r - y_1$.

9.4 Characterizing the Set of Stabilizing Nonlinear Controllers for Linear Plants

When the plant is linear, and we have one stabilizing (in general nonlinear) controller, it is again easy to parametrize all stabilizing controllers.

Theorem 5. (Verma, 1988) Let $P = ND^{-1}$ define a linear right coprime factorization of a linear plant and let $C = XY^{-1}$ define a right coprime realization of a




Fig. 17. Noisy identification problem with nominal nonlinear plant and linear stabilizing controller $XY^{-1} = \bar{Y}^{-1}\bar{X}$.

possibly nonlinear stabilising controller used in a negative feedback loop of the form of Figure 15. Then the set of all stabilizing controllers is given by $C = (X - DQ)(Y + NQ)^{-1}$ where Q is a stable operator, such that $(Y + NQ)^{-1}$ is well defined.

9.5 Characterizing the set of Stabilizing Controllers for Nonlinear Plants

If we now consider nonlinear plants, the linear theory starts to break down, and the key theorem *only goes one way*:

Theorem 6. Let $P = ND^{-1}$ and $C^\circ = XY^{-1}$ define right coprime factorizations of a plant and controller (both of which may be nonlinear). Then for any stable Q , $C = (X - DQ)(Y + NQ)^{-1}$ is a stabilizing controller.

This is an uncomfortable gap; using a variation of the concept of a left coprime realization, we can start to fill the gap later.

9.6 Identification using right coprime realizations

In this subsection, we will consider a nonlinear version of the earlier result on identification.

The key is to base the identification on a dual of the idea of Section 9.4. We suppose that a linear controller $C = XY^{-1} = \bar{Y}^{-1}\bar{X}$ stabilizes a nominal nonlinear plant $P^\circ = ND^{-1}$; with noisy measurements on the true plant P connected in a negative feedback loop with C , we seek to find stable S such that the plant is $(N - YS)(D + XS)^{-1}$.

Figure 17 illustrates the arrangement. As in the linear case, we aim to produce an open-loop identification problem, based on x, β and S .

In the noiseless case, (ie. $v = 0$), there holds

$$\begin{bmatrix} D & -X \\ N & Y \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ \beta \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ y \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9.14)$$

It follows that

$$(\bar{Y}D + \bar{X}N)x = \bar{Y}u + \bar{X}y = \bar{Y}r_2 + \bar{X}r_1, \quad (9.15)$$

[since $\bar{Y}(u - r_2) = \bar{X}(r_1 - y)$]. Also from (9.14),

$$\beta = [0 \ I] \begin{bmatrix} D & -X \\ N & Y \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ y \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9.16)$$

Stability of the closed loop ensures that x and β are (in principle) computable (boundedly) from r_1, r_2 and u, y respectively.

We are in principle free to replace ND^{-1} by $NR(DR)^{-1}$ for any stable and stably invertible R . Choose R as $(\bar{Y}D + \bar{X}N)^{-1}$. Then $(\bar{Y}D + \bar{X}N)$ in (9.15) becomes I , and

$$x = \bar{Y}r_2 + \bar{X}r_1.$$

To calculate β from u and y , we could use the fact that (from (9.14))

$$-X\beta = u - Dx = u - D(\bar{Y}r_2 + \bar{X}r_1),$$

and

$$Y\beta = y - N(\bar{Y}r_2 + \bar{X}r_1).$$

By exploiting the coprimeness of X and Y , β follows from u, y, r_1 and r_2 . This calculation of β would avoid computing separately the inverse in (9.16) as well as $(\bar{Y}D + \bar{X}N)^{-1}$.

In the noisy case, (where v is assumed independent of r_1 and r_2) (9.14) is replaced by

$$\begin{bmatrix} D & -X \\ N & Y \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ \beta \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ y - v \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9.17)$$

and assuming that the introduction of $R = (\bar{Y}D + \bar{X}N)^{-1}$ has been made, ie. that in effect $\bar{Y}D + \bar{X}N = I$, we have

$$x = \bar{Y}r_2 + \bar{X}r_1 - \bar{X}v. \quad (9.18)$$

Let K, L be linear stable operators with $-KX + LY = I$. We have

$$-X\beta = u - D(\bar{Y}r_2 + \bar{X}r_1 - \bar{X}v)$$

$$Y\beta = y - v - N(\bar{Y}r_2 + \bar{X}r_1 - \bar{X}v)$$

and so

$$\beta = K[u - D(\bar{Y}r_2 + \bar{X}r_1 - \bar{X}v)]$$

$$+ L[y - N(\bar{Y}r_2 + \bar{X}r_1 - \bar{X}v)]$$

$$- Lv. \quad (9.19)$$

The identification task is now, with known r_1, r_2, u and y and unknown v , to find a stable S such that $\beta = Sx$.

This is a non-standard open loop task, because of the noise at the input, as well as the output, with both input and output noise dependent on some underlying noise process disturbing the original system.

In a high signal to noise situation, it is possible to obtain a more conventional identification problem. Let S_L, D_L , and N_L denote the linearizations of S, D and N about the operating trajectory induced by the input $\bar{X}r_1 + \bar{Y}r_2$. Then $\beta = Sx$ implies

$$\beta = S(\bar{X}r_1 + \bar{Y}r_2) - S_L\bar{X}v$$

while also (9.19) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= Ku + Ly - KD(\bar{Y}r_2 + \bar{X}r_1) - LN(\bar{Y}r_2 + \bar{X}r_1) \\ &\quad + (KD_L + LN_L)\bar{X}v - Lv \\ &= \text{known signal} + (KD_L + LN_L)\bar{X}v - Lv \end{aligned}$$

Hence

known signal

$$= S(\bar{X}r_1 + \bar{Y}r_2) - (KD_L + LN_L + S_L)\bar{X}v + Lv$$

with a v independent of r_1 and r_2 . Determination of S is now conventional open loop (albeit nonlinear) identification problem.

The above ideas are simple when P° itself is linear, and are explained in (Dasgupta and Anderson, 1996).


9.7 Kernel Representations

In general, left fractional representations do not exist. As explained earlier, the fundamental reason is that one cannot write $L(u, y) = L_1(u) + L_2(y)$ in general, when L is a nonlinear operator. There is however a form of representation that carries many such properties; this has been demonstrated in a series of papers; see (Paice and der Schaft, 1994b; Paice and der Schaft, 1994a; Paice and der Schaft, 1995b).


We call an operator $R: u \times y \rightarrow z$ a *stable kernel representation* of a system when R is a stable mapping, and the equation $R(u, y) = z$ for a prescribed $x_0, u(\cdot)$ and $z(\cdot)$ is solvable for y ; further when $z = 0$, the system I/O mapping $y(\cdot) = \sum_{x_0} u(\cdot)$ is to be recovered. It is logical to use two different diagrammatic representations for $R(u, y) = z$, see Figures 18(a) and 18(b), depending on whether u and y are determining z , or u and z are determining y .

Example 3. Let $\dot{x} = f(x) + g(x)u \quad y = h(x)$ be a stable plant. Then

$$R: \begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= f(x) + g(x)u \\ z &= y - h(x), \end{aligned} \quad (9.20)$$



(a) Stable kernel representation, with u and y determining z via a stable mapping



(b) Plant represented by a stable kernel representation, so that u and z determine y ; $z = 0$ gives normal plant description

Fig. 18.

is a stable kernel representation.

Put another way, if a plant P is stable, and thus has a right coprime factorization $N(I)^{-1}$, it has a kernel representation.

$$R(u, y) = y - Pu = z. \quad (9.21)$$

Example 4. Suppose that $k(x)$ has the property that

$$\begin{aligned} L: \dot{x} &= f(x) - k(x)h(x) + g(x)u + k(x)y \\ z &= y - h(x), \end{aligned} \quad (9.22)$$

is a stable system, with $u(\cdot), y(\cdot)$ arbitrary inputs. Now set $z = 0$. Then this forces

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= f(x) + g(x)u \\ y &= h(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus L is a stable kernel representation.

[In Example 1 of Section 9.1. we gave a procedure which will generally, but not infallibly, yield such a $k(x)$, given an observability property. When $k(x)$ is chosen according to that procedure, L has unity L_2 gain from $[y^T \quad u^T]^T$ to z].

Example 5. Let P be a linear plant, with left coprime fractional representation $\bar{D}^{-1}\bar{N}$. Then $\bar{D}y - \bar{N}u = 0$ and the kernel representation is

A kernel representation is called *coprime* if it is stable and has a stable right inverse. A right inverse for L in Example 4 is provided by

$$\begin{aligned} L^{-1} : \dot{p} &= f(p) - g(p)g^T(p) \nabla V^T(p) + k(p)\xi \quad p(0) = x(0) \\ u &= -g^T(p) \nabla V^T(p) \\ y &= h(p) + \xi. \end{aligned} \quad (9.23)$$

Notice that L^{-1} can be expressed as $\begin{bmatrix} X \\ Y \end{bmatrix}$, even though L cannot be expressed as $[L_1 \ L_2]$. Also, if $p(0) \neq x(0)$, but L forgets the initial state as time evolves, then as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $L_{x(0)}L_{p(0)}^{-1}$ behaves more and more like the identity operator.

Feedback is described in the following way. Consider a plant P with stable kernel representation $R_P : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_p$ and a controller C with stable kernel representation $R_C : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_c$ which are interconnected, for the moment with no external inputs. (For convenience, sign inversions are assumed to be incorporated in the plant or controller, so the interconnection is a positive feedback interconnection). Then the loop is said to be *null-well-posed* if the equations

$$\begin{aligned} R_P(u, y) &= z_p \\ R_C(y, u) &= z_c, \end{aligned} \quad (9.24)$$

have unique solutions for all z_p, z_c ; if the solutions are stable for stable z_p, z_c the system is said to be null-stable. Note that the operators R_P, R_C can be initial condition dependent.

It is possible to show

- if a closed-loop system using stable kernel representation is null-stable, the kernel representations are coprime and there exist right coprime factorizations of plant and controller, and
- if a plant and controller have right coprime factorization and form a stable feedback system, coprime stable kernel representation can be found which together are null-stable. (They are not unique).

Although the definition of null-stability introduces certain extra signals viz z_p and z_c , these are not the same as the external signals r_1 and r_2 of say Figure 15, and the concept of null-stability is a more restricted concept than stability.

Youla-Kucera parametrizations are introduced as follows:

- Assume $P = ND^{-1}$ and $C = XY^{-1}$ are described by right coprime factorizations, and together form a stable closed-loop. (For convenience, assume the connection is a positive feedback controller)




Fig. 19. Construction of kernel representation of P_S from kernel representations of P and C (differently viewed) and from the Youla-Kucera parameter S

- Form stable kernel representations of P and C , viz. $R_P(u, y) = z_p$, $R_C(y, u) = z_c$.
- Let $S : \mathcal{Z}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_p$ and suppose S has a kernel representation $R_S(z_c, z_p) = z_s$.
- The modified plant P_S is defined by the kernel representation

$$R_{P_S}(u, y) = z_s = R_S(R_C(y, u), R_P(u, y)).$$

Figure 19 shows the arrangement, probably much more clearly. Notice that the subblocks R_P and R_C require the interpretations of both Figure 18b and Figure 18a, respectively. The parallel with Figure 13 (with noise signal absent) should also be noted.

The main conclusions are

- The set of all plants stabilized by C is obtained by letting S range over all stable operators. [In this case, one may take $R_S(z_c, z_p)$ as $-Sz_c + z_p$ and $R_{P_S}(u, y) = -SR_C(y, u) + R_P(u, y)$].
- The set of all controllers stabilizing P is obtained by an obvious dual characterisation involving a $Q : z_p \rightarrow z_c$.
- P_S is stabilized by C_Q if and only if S is stabilized by Q .

Example 6. Suppose P and C are linear, with left coprime realizations $\bar{D}^{-1}\bar{N}$ and $\bar{Y}^{-1}\bar{X}$. Then $R_P(u, y) = \bar{D}y - \bar{N}u = z_p$ and $R_C(y, u) = \bar{Y}u - \bar{X}y = z_c$. Now $R_S(z_c, z_p)$ is $-Sz_c + z_p = z_s$, which implies $(\bar{D} - S\bar{X})y - (\bar{N} + S\bar{Y})u = z_s$ for $R_{P_S}(u, y)$, and the left realization is $(\bar{D} - S\bar{X})^{-1}(\bar{N} + S\bar{Y})$.

These results can be pushed to handle plants with external inputs. By way of general comment, it turns out that

- closed-loop stability is most easily handled with right coprime fractional representations
- Youla-Kucera parametrizations are most easily handled with stable kernel representations
- one requires results on the ability to switch between

- right coprime fractional representations
- Youla-Kucera parametrizations are most easily handled with stable kernel representations
- one requires results on the ability to switch between the two types of representation

10. CRITIQUE

In this brief concluding section, we aim to record some of the issues that are not well addressed by the Youla-Kucera parameter idea and its variants:

- Decentralized controller design. There is no explicit parametrization of all stabilizing decentralized controllers for a prescribed plant.
- Linear time-invariant plant identification in a sampled-data loop. It is clear that substantial modification of the earlier theory would be required to handle identification of a continuous-time plant when a nominal model is known and a sampled-data controller is connected.
- Degree explosion: $P(s)$ can have degree equal to degree P° + degree C° + degree S
- Q design given a plant S , and nominal P° and C° . This point has been well described
- Keeping S simple when unknownness is simple. Suppose that a plant is completely known except for the value assumed by two physical parameters appearing in the equation of the plant. It is generally not straightforward to have a very simple S capturing this unknownness. Again, suppose P comprises a memoryless saturating nonlinearity (unknown) followed by a known linear dynamic part. It is not straightforward to have S memoryless
- More generally, utility of the nonlinear results has yet really to be established

11. REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. D. O. and J. B. Moore (1970). *Linear Optimal Control*. Prentice Hall. New Jersey.
- Anderson, B. D. O. and J. B. Moore (1990). *Optimal Control: Linear Quadratic Methods*. Prentice Hall. New Jersey.
- Anderson, B. D. O., F. De Bruyne and M. Gevers (1994). Computing LQG plant and controller perturbations. In: *Proceedings 33rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. pp. 1439–1444.
- Boyd, S. P. and C. H. Barrett (1991). *Linear controller design: the limits of performance*. Prentice-Hall. New Jersey.
- Chakravarty, A. and J. B. Moore (1986). Aircraft flutter suppression via adaptive LQG control. In: *Proceedings American Control Conference*. pp. 488–493.
- Dasgupta, S. and B. D. O. Anderson (1996). On the parametrization and construction of nonlinear stabilizing controllers. *Automatica*, to appear.
- DeBruyne, F., B. D. O. Anderson, M. Gevers and J. Leblond (1995). LQG control with pole constraints using the Youla parametrization. In: *Proceedings 3rd European Control Conference*. pp. 2494–2499.
- Desoer, C. A., R. W. Liu, J. Murray and R. Saeks (1980). Feedback system design: the fractional representation approach to analysis and synthesis. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* AC-25, 399–412.
- Doyle, J. C., B. A. Francis and A.R. Tannenbaum (1992). *Feedback Control Theory*. Macmillan. New York.
- Forney, G. D. (1970). Convolutional codes-part I: algebraic structure. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* IT-16, 720–738.
- Georgiou, T. T. and M. C. Smith (1990). Optimal robustness in the gap metric. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* AC-35, 673–686.
- Green, M. and D. J. N. Limebeer (1995). *Linear Robust Control*. Prentice Hall. New Jersey.
- Hansen, F. R. (1989). Fractional representation approach to closed-loop identification and experiment design. PhD thesis. Stanford University.
- Hansen, F. R., G. F. Franklin and R. L. Kosut (1989). Closed-loop identification via the fractional representation: experiment design. In: *Proceedings American Control Conference*. pp. 386–391.
- Kucera, V. (1975). Stability of discrete linear feedback systems. In: *Proceedings 6th IFAC World Congress*. Boston. p. 44.1.
- Lee, W. S., B. D. O. Anderson, I. M. Y. Mareels and R. L. Kosut (1993). A new approach to adaptive robust control. *International Journal Adaptive Control and Signal Processing* 7, 183–211.
- Lee, W. S., B. D. O. Anderson, R. L. Kosut and I. M. Y. Mareels (1992). On adaptive robust control and control relevant system identification. In: *Proceedings American Control Conference*. Chicago. pp. 2834–2841.
- Lee, W. S., B. D. O. Anderson, R. L. Kosut and I. M. Y. Mareels (1995). On some key issues in the wind-surfer approach to adaptive robust control. *Automatica* 31, 1619–1636.
- Moore, J. B. and T. Tay (1989). Loop recovery via H_∞/H^2 sensitivity recovery. *International Journal of Control* 49, 1249–1271.
- Moore, J. B., L. Xia and K. Glover (1986). On improving control-loop robustness of model-matching con-

- trollers. *Systems and Control Letters* 1, 83–87.
- Morari, M. and E. Zafriou (1989). *Robust Process Control*. Prentice Hall. New Jersey.
- Nett, C. N., C. A. Jacobsen and M. J. Balas (1984). A connection between state-space and doubly coprime fractional representations. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* AC-29, 831–832.
- Newton, G. C., L. A. Gould and J. F. Kaiser (1957). *Analytic design of linear feedback controls*. Wiley. New York.
- Paice, A. D. B. and A. J. Van der Schaft (1994a). Stable kernel representations and the Youla parametrization for nonlinear systems. In: *Proceedings 33rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*.
- Paice, A. D. B. and A. J. Van der Schaft (1994b). Stable kernel representations as nonlinear left coprime factorizations. In: *Proceedings 33rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*.
- Paice, A. D. B. and A. J. Van der Schaft (1995a). On the parametrization and construction of nonlinear stabilizing controllers. In: *Proceedings 3rd IFAC Symposium on Nonlinear control systems*.
- Paice, A. D. B. and A. J. Van der Schaft (1995b). The Youla parametrization for nonlinear feedback systems with additive disturbances. In: *Proceedings 34th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*.
- Paice, A. D. B., J. B. Moore and R. Horowitz (1992). Nonlinear feedback system stability via coprime factorization analysis. *Journal of Mathematical Systems, Estimation and Control* 2, 293–321.
- Ross, R. and C. L. E. Swartz (1995). The application of dynamic operability assessment to flotation circuit design. In: *IFAC Mining Mineral and Metal processing '95 Reprints*. Sun City, South Africa. pp. 65–70.
- Scherpen, J. M. A. and A. J. van der Schaft (1994). Normalized coprime factorizations and balancing for unstable nonlinear systems. *International Journal of Control* 60, 1193–1222.
- Schrama, R. J. P. (1991). An open-loop solution to the approximate closed-loop identification problem. In: *Proceedings 9th IFAC/IFORS Symposium on Identification and Systems Parameter Estimation*. Budapest. pp. 1602–1607.
- Tay, T. T. and J. B. Moore (1991). Enhancement of fixed controllers via adaptive- Q disturbance estimate feedback. *Automatica* 27, 39–53.
- Tay, T. T., J. B. Moore and R. Horowitz (1989). Indirect adaptive techniques for fixed controller performance enhancement. *International Journal of Control* 50, 1941–1959.
- VandenHof, P. M. J., R. J. P. Schrama, R. A. de Callafon and O. H. Bosgna (1995). Identification of normalized coprime plant factors from closed-loop experimental data. *European Journal of Control* 1, 62–74.
- VanderSchaft, A. J. (1995). Robust stabilization of nonlinear systems via stable kernel representations with l_2 gain bounded uncertainty. *Systems and Control letters* 24, 75–81.
- Verma, M. S. (1988). Coprime fractional representations of nonlinear systems. *International Journal of Control* 48, 897–918.
- Vidysagar, M. (1985). *Control systems synthesis: a factorization approach*. MIT Press. Cambridge, Mass.
- Yan, W. and J. B. Moore (1993). Stable linear fractional transformation with applications to stabilization and multistage H_∞ control design. *Mathematical Theory of Control* 142, 399–416.
- Youla, D. C., H. A. Jabri and Jnr. J. J. Bongiorno (1976). Modern Wiener-Hopf design of optimal controllers; part II: the multivariable case. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* AC-21, 319–338.
- Zames, G. (1981). Feedback and optimal sensitivity: model reference transformations, multiplicative seminorms, and approximate inverses. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* AC-26, 301–320.
- Zhou, K., J. C. Doyle and K. Glover (1995). *Robust and Optimal Control*. Prentice Hall. New Jersey.